

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent. By this amendment, claims 1, 3, 15, and 17 are amended to further define the invention to overcome the rejections in the outstanding Office Action, and claim 10 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments is discussed below. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all pending rejections in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

More specifically, the subject matter of claim 3 has been partially incorporated into claim 1; and the subject matter of claim 17 has been partially incorporated into claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants assert that there are no new issues to search and/or consider and thus entry of the instant amendment respectfully requested and proper.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgment that, based on the July 19, 2005 response, the drawings have been approved, the amended abstract has overcome the objection, and the claim amendments have overcome the claim objections.

Request for Indication of allowable subject matter and, in the alternative, request for corrected Official Action

Initially, Applicants note that claims 12-14 have not been addressed in the Official Action. Accordingly, Applicants presume claims 12-14 have allowable subject and request for an indication of the same. If this is not the case, Applicants request a corrected Official Action that sets forth the status of these claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,677,590 to Matsuda et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

The invention is directed to an electron gun and, in particular, an electron gun having, *inter alia*, a plurality of electrodes and an anode. One of the plurality of electrodes is a multiple element electrode. In particular, the multiple element electrode has a first sub-electrode and a second sub-electrode with at least one different dimension from each other. Exemplary aspects of the multiple element electrodes having a first sub-electrode and a second sub-electrode are shown in Figures 2 and 5-9.

The Examiner asserts that the Matsuda et al. electrode 6 of Figure 2 has different dimensions. In particular, the Examiner states that entrances and exits of the electrode of the upper electrode are *different*. Applicants respectfully assert that different entrances and exits of electrode 6 does not change the dimension of the electrode. Indeed changing the entrances and exits merely changes the internal structure and not the dimensions.

To the contrary, the electrodes shown Applicants' Figure 2 has a different overall width W1 and W2; and a different height H1 and H2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully note that this is a different dimension and clearly not anticipated by Matsuda et al.

The Examiner further asserts that the upper electrode of Figure 2 has a centrally located piece that changes the dimensions. This centrally located piece appears to be some undisclosed structure that may or may not be part of the electrode. Applicants note that when you change the internal structure of an electrode you do not change the dimension of the electrode. This is true with addition of structure inside the electrode or by changing the exits and entrances as noted above. None of the asserted differences affect the dimensions as set forth by claims 1 and 15.

Finally, the Examiner contends that box shaped structure shown on a lower electrode 6 changes the dimensions. However, the Matsuda et al. disclosure is wholly silent to what this box shaped structure is. Matsuda does not indicate that this is part of the electrode, beading glass 9, or any other portion of structure. Even if this box structure was part of the electrode, it is unclear from the cutaway drawings whether this same structure might be located on mirror opposite side of the lower electrode 6 thus resulting in the same dimensions.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 1-11 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,642,646 to Kwon. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Noting that Matsuda et al. does not disclose electrodes that receive a voltage, the Examiner alleges it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Matsuda et al. with the teachings of Kwon. The Examiner further argues that such a combination would result in the claimed invention.

However, even if Matsuda et al. and Kwon were combined, they would fail to disclose the invention as claimed. Instead, the resultant combination would most likely not include, *inter alia*, a multiple-element electrode that includes a first sub-electrode and a second sub-electrode that are arranged having gaps and different electrode dimensions as noted above. Accordingly, the proposed combination does not disclose and/or suggest all of the claimed features.

Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests the claimed subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15, and dependent claims 16-20, are allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 15-20 be withdrawn.

In view of the fact that none of the art of record, whether considered alone or in any proper combination, discloses or suggests the present invention as defined by the pending claims, and in further view of the above remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Dependent Claims

With regard to dependent claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-20, Applicants assert that these claims are allowable on their own merit and at least because they depend on one of independent claims, which Applicants submit have been shown to be allowable.

Amendment Entry

Pursuant to MPEP §714.13, Applicants contend that entry of the present amendment is appropriate because the proposed amended claims avoid the rejections set forth in the last Office Action, resulting in the application being placed in condition for allowance, or, alternatively, the revised claims place the application in better condition for purposes of appeal. Furthermore, the revised claims do not present any new issues that would require any further consideration and/or search by the Examiner, and the amendment does not present any additional claims without canceling a like number of pending claims. More specifically, the subject matter of claims 3 and 7 has been partially incorporated into claim 1; and the subject matter of claims 17 and 20 has been partially incorporated into claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants assert that there are no new issues to search and/or consider and thus entry of the

instant amendment is respectfully requested and proper. Accordingly, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicants submit that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued for this application.

Respectfully Submitted,


Hae-Chan Park
Registration No. 50,114

Date: January 4, 2006

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Telephone No. 703-288-5105
Facsimile No. 703-288-5139